

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT**

ENDC/PV.273
14 July 1966
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 14 July 1966, at 10.30 a.m.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

NOV 18 1966

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

Chairman:

Mr. A.F. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA (Brazil)

cdc.66-600

66-21123

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A.F. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA
Mr. G. de CARVALHO SILOS
Mr. A. da COSTA GUIMARAES
Mr. C.H. PAULINO PRATES

Bulgaria:

Mr. C. LUKANOV
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV
Mr. D. POPOV
Mr. T. DAMIANOV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. C.J. MARSHALL
Mr. P.D. LEE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. Z. CERNIK
Mr. V. VAJNAR
Mr. R. KLEIN

Ethiopia:

Mr. A. ABERRA
Mr. A. ZELLEKE
Mr. B. ASSFAW

India:

Mr. DINESH SINGH
Mr. V.C. TRIVEDI
Mr. K.P. LUKOSE
Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI
Mr. S. AVETTA
Mr. F. SORO

Mexico:

Mr. A. GOMEZ ROBLEDO
Mr. M. TELLO MACIAS

Nigeria:

Mr. G.O. IJEWERE
Mr. M.B. BRIMAH

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

Poland:

Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI
Mr. B. KAJDY

Romania:

Mr. V. DUMITRESCU
Mr. E. GLASER
Mr. C. UNGUREANU
Mr. A. COROIANU

Sweden:

Mr. P. HAMMARSKJOLD
Mr. R. BOMAN
Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN
Mr. Y.M. VORONTSOV
Mr. M.P. SHELEPIN
Mr. I.I. CHEPROV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALLAF
Mr. A. OSMAN
Mr. M. KASSEM
Mr. A.A. SALAM

United Kingdom:

Sir Harold BEELEY
Mr. J.H. TAHOURDIN
Miss E.J.M. RICHARDSON
Mr. M.R. MORLAND

United States of America:

Mr. G. BUNN
Mr. C.G. BREAM
Mr. A. NEIDLE
Mr. P.S. BRIDGES

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. O. FREY

The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): I declare open the two hundred and seventy-third plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Speaking as the representative of Brazil, I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the kind words of welcome addressed to me in this Committee by all the speakers.

I now have the honour and pleasure of calling upon the Minister of State for External Affairs of India, Mr. Dinesh Singh.

Mr. Dinesh SINGH (India): I am deeply grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege that you have accorded to me this morning of addressing the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. I returned to Geneva the day before yesterday from Cairo and Brioni, where I was with our Prime Minister; and I bring to you and to the members of the Committee her greetings and her ardent hope that in the near future your deliberations will lead to positive progress towards the conclusion of an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

As I was to speak in this Committee today, a friend of mine reminded me of a prayer written by Stephen Vincent Benet, which was read out by President Roosevelt when he coined the phrase "United Nations" on 14 June 1942. Many years have since passed, and the United Nations has weathered many storms. It might be well to remember this prayer today, because it gives an insight into the minds of the founders of the United Nations and also indicates the course they had set for this august body. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read out this prayer:

"Our earth is but a small star in the great universe. Yet of it we can make, if we choose, a planet unvexed by war, untroubled by hunger and fear, undivided by senseless distinctions of race, colour or theory."

Also living in a small part of this planet, we in India have been equally concerned with the problem that President Roosevelt talked about. In our country great experiments have been made with peace and peaceful coexistence. The teachings of Buddha are a living symbol of our great devotion to peace for many thousands of years now. In our own lifetime Mahatma Gandhi's experiments with peace, non-violence and human understanding are still fresh with us, and we continue to be inspired and guided by them. Our subsequent effort to establish in our country a democratic and socialist society, based on fundamental human rights and giving equality to all

(Mr. Dinesh Singh, India)

citizens irrespective of colour or creed, is no modest contribution towards the general establishment of those values in the larger international community.

With regard to the work of this Committee, I recall with very great satisfaction the initiative taken by our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, which culminated in the signing of the partial test-ban Treaty (ENDC/100/Rev.1) on 5 August 1963. In itself the Treaty does not reach the goals that the United Nations has set, but it does make a beginning. It is my sincere hope that we shall be able to move forward by substituting the word "complete" for "partial" in the test-ban Treaty. That would change the partial nature of the Treaty and make it universal and comprehensive.

We have consistently urged upon the international community, over the years, the vital necessity of disarmament and peaceful coexistence. India has also advocated that as a parallel endeavour, and in order to facilitate the achievement of general and complete disarmament, collateral measures should be adopted --- measures which are equitable and effective and which build up mutual confidence and reduce international tension. We are heartened to note that the desire for peace is growing. In the past, wars were fought to end wars. We are now thinking of a world without wars. The futility of war has been more than established and the yearning for peace is so great that we are all compelled to apply our minds to seeking solutions that will save humanity from all possible future armed conflicts. It is in that context that this Committee has been meeting here, and the world has pinned great hopes on these deliberations.

We recognize that the progress has been slow. This has been of necessity, because the solution we are seeking is based not only upon the willing co-operation of a group of nations but upon the active collaboration of all the countries of the world. We are engaged here in a novel experiment to accomplish something which humanity has never witnessed before -- a world without arms. Besides international co-operation, measures for disarmament and for arms control affect vitally the security of all nations. They have therefore to be negotiated with patience and prudence. They have to be just, equitable, balanced and of universal application. They have also to inspire confidence, without which no agreement can be workable.

We shall, however, have to strain every nerve to move forward rapidly. Only the other day I was reading about the estimates of United States expenditures in Viet-Nam, and they are only an infinitesimal part of world expenditures on armaments. It struck my mind because that is a topical subject today. Mr. Emmet John Hughes stated in the magazine Newsweek of 11 July 1966:

"The cost of the Viet-Nam war -- exceeding \$20 billion a year - signifies a sum that could mean quite different purchases.

(Mr. Dinesh Singh, India)

"It could --- each month --- finance the complete, seven-year training of almost 70,000 scientists.

"It could --- each month --- double the resources of the Agency for International Development for a full year's economic programs in 38 foreign countries.

"It could --- each month --- create three Rockefeller Foundations.

"It could --- each month --- pay the full year's cost of state and local police in all 50 States.

"It could --- every year --- provide a 10 per cent salary increase for every U.S. public-school teacher.

"It could --- every year --- double the social-security benefits paid to 20 million Americans".

Further estimates could be made of the expenditure of other countries, even if they are not involved in actual fighting but are only maintaining arms. Taken together, those figures are staggering. Is there any reason for us to spend so much money on destruction when three-quarters of humanity needs food, medicine and books and is largely living on the margin of human existence? Measures taken in those fields could help them to cross the threshold from poverty and misery to a life of human dignity and prosperity. Yet we go on inventing newer and more powerful weapons of destruction. That is because we are living in fear, and it is that fear from which we have to free ourselves.

We have to remove the causes of fear, so that there can be better understanding in the world; and in such an atmosphere of confidence and understanding we may be able to find the answer that this Committee has been attempting to seek. I believe that one of the basic factors in this regard could be an agreement on complete renunciation of the use of force. If all countries can be persuaded not to use force to settle their disputes, a climate may be created in which general and complete disarmament can become acceptable.

This Committee has been deliberating here for a considerable time now upon the possibility of reaching agreement. Many suggestions have been considered and have been very carefully debated: reduction of arms, setting limits --- these are matters with which the Committee is familiar. At the same time the world has passed through the stages of armament at different levels; yet it has not put an end to war. We have

(Mr. Dinesh Singh, India)

to build the desire in the hearts of the people to avoid wars, the conviction that wars should not be necessary. Only then can we hope to achieve disarmament; only then can we hope that some method will be found to put an end to the use of force. If we can all agree as a beginning to give up the use of force, then perhaps a climate will be created in which there will be greater understanding, less suspicion and no fear. We in India have laid great stress on that aspect of international understanding and have given proof of our belief in peaceful methods by signing the Tashkent Declaration.

International consideration of the problems of disarmament has generally proceeded along two well-defined lines. In the first instance, those problems are being debated in many international forums, especially in assemblies comprising all the nations of the world, such as the United Nations General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations, which is composed of the entire Membership of that Organization. In this context we hope also that the world disarmament conference contemplated by the General Assembly (A/RES/2030(XX); ENDC/162) will meet next year as scheduled. There have been other efforts, too, such as the recommendations made by the Conferences of Heads of State and Government of Non-aligned Countries held in Belgrade and Cairo (A/5763), and by the earlier meeting of the Afro-Asian countries in Bandung.

Secondly, this Committee is endeavouring to seek a solution by negotiation. As we all know, the questions of general and complete disarmament and arms control are highly complex issues, requiring detailed and technical discussions and negotiations to be carried out with patience and understanding. Treaties, agreements, protocols and memoranda embodying legal and formal obligations have to be concluded with care and precision. The international community has therefore rightly adopted simultaneously that second approach to the question of disarmament: that is, of entrusting the work of negotiation to a small body.

I have not talked about the horror of nuclear war; it is too terrible to condense into a few sentences. All of us know full well that a nuclear war would completely annihilate the whole of humanity, indeed all life as we know it today. The urgent need to find an answer in order to save mankind from disaster cannot be over-emphasized. Much of this task of preventing disaster has to be carried out by this Committee. A way must be found to save mankind from setting the world ablaze and destroying it.

(Mr. Dinesh Singh, India)

There is about this search which the representatives are making for solutions to problems of disarmament a sense of great urgency but equally a demand for the highest imagination -- political, economic and technological. It is given to few men and generations to witness so many important efforts being made, in conditions in which the rest of humanity can share in the success of this Committee and reap in their own lifetime the benefit from its efforts to secure peace without arms. We cannot afford today to be "silent witnesses of a vanished dream".

Before I conclude, I should like to quote from a statement made by our Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, to the Afro-Asian group at the United Nations in New York in April this year. Referring to the United Nations, she said that our purpose was to build -

"... a world without war, a world based on understanding, tolerance and sympathy; not a world where war is just kept in check by the balance of armed strength." That is the purpose to which all of us are dedicated.

Mr. ROSECHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): First of all I should like to welcome the Minister of State for External Affairs of the Republic of India, Mr. Dinesh Singh. We are glad to see him here in our Committee. We know the profound interest which the Government of India displays in the disarmament negotiations. The Soviet delegation listened with interest to Mr. Dinesh Singh's statement. We understand and sympathize with the views he expressed regarding the necessity of solving the urgent problems of disarmament, and we share his hopes for further progress in this important field of international relations.

The Soviet delegation would like in its statement today to dwell first of all on the question of general and complete disarmament. At the meeting of 21 April, immediately before the interruption of our work, we drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the need to make greater efforts in the negotiations on this problem (ENDC/PV.258, pp.4 et seq). At past meetings a number of delegations have dealt with the question of general and complete disarmament. At our meeting on 12 July the representative of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Cernik, and the representative of Bulgaria, Mr. Lukanov, dwelt on this question, in their thorough and detailed statements (ENDC/PV.272), pointing out that the Eighteen-Nation Committee must make every effort to reach agreement on general and complete disarmament. Earlier, on

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

7 July, the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Khallaf, showing justified concern at the state of affairs in the negotiations on general and complete disarmament, rightly appealed to the Committee to redouble its efforts in this field and to break the deadlock on the problem of disarmament (ENDC/PV.271, p.4). It is perfectly obvious that the negotiation of a treaty on general and complete disarmament has been and remains the principal and fundamental task of the Eighteen-Nation Committee.

We fully realize that we have to resume discussion of the problem of general and complete disarmament in a complex international situation. In South-East Asia the United States continues to intensify its war of aggression against the Viet-Nameese people, thus increasing international tension still further. In the very centre of Europe a serious source of danger has come into being, engendered by the revanchist policy of West Germany, which is striving to obtain access to nuclear weapons. The armaments race, and especially the race for nuclear missile armaments, is spiralling swiftly and steeply upwards, adding to the military arsenals of States more and more stocks of lethal weapons.

The responsibility for the unrestrained stimulation of the arms race rests on the United States. The United States is increasing the number of its troops, which has already surpassed three million men and is continuing to grow. The United States is putting through Congress a military budget unequalled since the Second World War. In the last five years -- that is, precisely throughout the period during which our Committee has been conducting negotiations on disarmament -- the United States, according to official data, has increased the number of fighting units of its land forces by 45 per cent, its means of troop air transportation by 100 per cent, the quantity and strength of the nuclear weapons in its strategic forces by 200 per cent, and the quantity of tactical nuclear weapons stationed in Europe by 67 per cent.

In the present world situation enormous difficulties stand in the way of a solution of the problem of disarmament, but however great these difficulties may be, the achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament must remain, as before, the ultimate objective of our negotiations towards which we must strive.

Resolution 2031 (XX) of the United Nations General Assembly -

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

"Requests the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to continue its efforts towards making substantial progress in reaching agreement on the question of general and complete disarmament under effective international control ... and to report to the General Assembly, as appropriate, on the progress achieved" (ENDC/161).

The Soviet Union has always regarded and still regards the achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament as one of the most important aims of its foreign policy. We see in general and complete disarmament a reliable means of freeing mankind from the menace of war, a sure way towards the strengthening of peace and of international security. In the message of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. Kosygin, to the members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, dated 1 February (ENDC/167), it is pointed out that the programme of general and complete disarmament submitted to the Committee for consideration is still our programme, aimed at the complete elimination of armed forces and armaments.

The Eighteen-Nation Committee has before it a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet Union (ENDC/2/Rev.1 and Add.1). That draft, the contents of which are well known to the participants in the negotiations, affords every opportunity for a positive solution of this question. The Soviet Union maintains a flexible, constructive approach to the problem of general and complete disarmament. Speaking at the twentieth session of the General Assembly on 24 September 1965, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Mr. A. A. Gromyko, said:

"We have no biased approach as to the starting point in the process of reducing and eliminating the armed forces of States, the stages into which it should be broken down and arrangements for control over disarmament --- and we repeat: over disarmament, not over armaments. What is important is that genuine disarmament should be assured, and the removal of the danger of nuclear war, and that the measures being carried out should not offer any military advantages to either of the sides" (A/PV.1335, p.17).

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

It must be noted with regret, however, that at present the Eighteen-Nation Committee is just as far from the goal of general and complete disarmament as it was at the very outset of its work. The United States is displaying in the Committee a complete lack of interest in the discussion of the problem of general and complete disarmament; it is creating pessimism in regard to this problem. From this position taken by the United States both here in the Committee and outside, one can draw the conclusion that the United States does not want an agreement on disarmament. In fact, the negative position of the United States and the other Western Powers members of NATO on questions of general and complete disarmament is in contrast with the position of the rest of the members of the Committee.

In the course of the negotiations on general and complete disarmament, besides the delegations of the socialist countries, those of the non-aligned countries are making an importance contribution towards the achievement of an agreement on this problem. In his statement on 7 July the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Khallaf, expressed a number of interesting ideas in regard to the possible procedure for our future work in solving the problem of general and complete disarmament, and also in regard to the approach to this problem. We entirely agree with the view he expressed that the nuclear weapons to be retained during the process of disarmament as a so-called "umbrella" must be agreed upon and strictly limited; the whole concept of the retention of an agreed quantity of such weapons during the implementation of disarmament was put forward by the Soviet Union, in the words of Mr. Khallaf, "in order to facilitate the discussion and accomplishment of general and complete disarmament" (ENDC/PV.271, p.8). That statement by Mr. Khallaf is very important for understanding the essence of the proposal of the delegation of the United Arab Republic in regard to a working group.

Attempts have already been made more than once in the Committee to move forward the consideration of the problem of general and complete disarmament by requesting a special working group to examine specific questions relating to the retention of an agreed, strictly limited quantity of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles during disarmament. Each time the obstacle encountered was the unwillingness of the Western Powers to agree to the concept of decisive elimination of the means of waging a nuclear missile war.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

And now again the representatives of the Western Powers raise the question of setting up a working group to deal with the question of the reduction of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles on the basis of the Western plan, which does not ensure the accomplishment of general and complete disarmament. Such an approach, as the Soviet delegation has already stated at our last meeting on 12 July (ENDC/PV.272, pp.31-32), is unacceptable to us. For the activities of the working group to be really useful to our negotiations, they must have as their essential starting point an agreement in principle on the earliest possible elimination of the means of waging nuclear war. The position of the Soviet delegation on this question has long been known to the members of the Committee.

The Soviet Union is firmly resolved to do everything to bring closer the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament and to secure the assurance of reliable international security. All the thoughts of the socialist States are directed towards the prevention of war and the strengthening of peace. The recent meeting in Bucharest of the Political Advisory Committee of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization bore witness to our ardent desire for peace. The documents adopted at that meeting -- the Declaration on the Strengthening of Peace and Security in Europe and the Statement in connexion with United States Aggression in Viet-Nam -- lay down a realistic concrete programme for putting an end to the schemings of the forces of aggression, propose measures for ensuring European security, and open up new paths for the settlement of contentious international questions by peaceful means. The strengthening of peace in Europe and the implementation of the measures proposed by the Political Advisory Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries would undoubtedly have a favourable influence on the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament.

We should now like to dwell on the problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. This is one of those disarmament problems in regard to which it is particularly clear how important a role is played by each State in seeking paths towards a world without weapons and without wars, and about which the Minister of State for External Affairs of India has just spoken today. Indeed, in the question of non-proliferation the role of States that do not possess nuclear weapons is in many respects no less important than the position of the nuclear Powers, because, if there is the determination not to allow further proliferation of nuclear weapons, the non-nuclear States can ensure that such dissemination shall not occur.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

In our statement today we should like to deal with a very important aspect of this problem relating to the security of the non-nuclear States. The point in question has already been raised in the Eighteen-Nation Committee: namely, that an agreement on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, by laying down certain limits for the subsequent endeavours of States to ensure their national security, raises the question of working out guarantees that the interests of the non-nuclear States will not suffer if they refrain from steps directed towards the acquisition of nuclear weapons. It should be stressed that in raising this question the non-aligned States give particular attention to the point that what is required is not guarantees to a non-nuclear State on the part of one or more nuclear States but a multilateral agreement which would not affect the status of independence and neutrality which the non-aligned States enjoy.

This idea of a multilateral guarantee is of undoubted interest and great importance. If, for example, all States at present possessing nuclear weapons were here and now to agree never in any circumstances to use these weapons, such an agreement would be an important step towards the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and the easing of international tension. It would be a step, the importance of which it is hard to overestimate, towards ensuring the security of non-nuclear States.

The Soviet Government, wishing to give a straight answer to the question of ensuring the national security of non-nuclear States in connexion with the conclusion of an agreement on non-proliferation, has declared its readiness to include in such an agreement an article on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States (ENDC/167). The Soviet delegation has already, at our meeting of 23 June, stated its view on how such an article could be drafted in concrete terms (ENDC/PV.267, p.12). This wording is by way of example, but in our opinion reflects clearly enough the essence of our proposal; and we note with satisfaction that it has met with a positive response in the Committee from many delegations. Naturally we are prepared to consider the comments and arguments which may be put forward by members of the Committee in connexion with our proposal to include in the draft treaty on non-proliferation an article which would bind the nuclear Powers not to use nuclear weapons and not to threaten to use them against non-nuclear States.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

The Soviet delegation has stressed and continues to stress that we regard the solution of the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons not as an end in itself, not as a single and isolated measure, but as a link in a chain of other disarmament measures that would lead to the elimination of the threat of nuclear war. The essence of our approach is that we deem it necessary not merely to limit the number of members of the so-called "nuclear club" to its present membership, but to do away with this "club" altogether and to prohibit and destroy nuclear weapons. An agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons must serve only as a starting-point for the accomplishment of a whole series of other measures of disarmament and for the reduction of international tension, and there is a direct reference to this in the Soviet draft treaty on non-proliferation (ENDC/164).

Following an agreement on non-proliferation, it would be particularly important to accomplish other measures of nuclear disarmament: namely, prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, and destruction under appropriate international control of all stockpiles of such weapons and of their delivery vehicles. It would also be important, for that purpose, to accomplish measures for the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries. In speaking about the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons the Soviet delegation always bears in mind the direct relationship between the solution of this problem and the complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, the establishment of nuclear-free zones, and the accomplishment of other measures of nuclear disarmament.

The Soviet draft treaty on non-proliferation is based on the desire to ensure the interests of all parties to the treaty without any advantages whatever for nuclear States or for the members of military alliances.

At the next meeting of the Committee the Soviet delegation intends, by way of a detailed, article-by-article comparison of the Soviet and United States draft treaties to analyse carefully their contents once again, also from the point of view which I have just mentioned, in order to outline more clearly the possibilities of agreeing on a text which would ensure an effective solution of the problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

We should now like to make a few comments on the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom at our meeting of 5 July. Lord Chalfont stated then that "perhaps the time has come to examine the Soviet text ..." (ENDC/PV.270, p.28). We must say that Lord Chalfont expressed himself with characteristic English restraint -- he made

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

an "understatement". The Soviet draft treaty on non-proliferation was submitted in September last year, and in the ten months that have since elapsed the delegations of the Western countries have had ample time to set about its examination. But if they are now prepared to engage in this business-like work, then better late than never.

It must be recognized, however, that the comments on the Soviet draft treaty on non-proliferation which we have just heard from the representative of the United Kingdom do not provide any evidence of a desire to examine our text in a business-like way. The principal device of criticism used by the delegation of the United Kingdom in regard to the Soviet draft is that it denounces as unclear all those provisions which the Western Powers are unwilling to accept. It is hard to believe that the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Chalfont, does not know, for instance, what a nuclear Power or a non-nuclear State is. He also asked the Soviet delegation whether it could "identify the point at which preparation for the manufacture of nuclear weapons begins and peaceful nuclear activity ends" (ibid., p.34). In this case the United Kingdom delegation expressed puzzlement in connexion with a provision that is also contained in the United States draft treaty (ENDC/152 and Add.1), which, as we know, has the support of the United Kingdom and, according to Lord Chalfont, is perfectly clear.

I should like to draw your attention to article 1, paragraph 2 of the United States draft, binding the parties not to provide assistance in "preparations for the manufacture of nuclear weapons. In this connexion I should like to ask whether this provision of the United States draft treaty which I have just quoted is not clear to the United Kingdom delegation. If it is not clear, then of course the United Kingdom delegation is entitled to put a question to the United States delegation — it is geographically closer — and to receive an immediate answer on this unclear provision.

The United Kingdom representative was also puzzled by the term "possession". We note, by the way, that this concept did not puzzle the representative of Canada, Mr. Burns, who observed at the same meeting that our most serious differences related to the prohibition of the "acquisition ... of nuclear weapons from a nuclear Power by nations which do not now possess them" (ENDC/PV.270, p.18). The fact that the United Kingdom delegation is nonplussed by the term "possession", which has appeared for hundreds of years in thousands of treaties, can be explained only by the fact that it

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

does not wish to understand the other side taking part in the negotiations. Such an approach to the negotiations is deliberately fallacious -- it condemns them to failure.

It should be noted that the comments of the United Kingdom representative on the Soviet draft treaty on non-proliferation are still very far from businesslike. In stating that the Soviet delegation is in no way prompted by a feeling of pride of authorship and that we are far from claiming that no amendments and changes can be made in the text of the Soviet draft, the Soviet delegation has already more than once declared its readiness to examine amendments and additions to the Soviet draft from the point of view of the extent to which the acceptance of such amendments would ensure the solution of the problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

On the other hand, the Western delegations -- and this was particularly clear from the statement made by the United Kingdom representative, Lord Chalfont -- are prepared to conduct negotiations only within an incomparably narrower framework: that of the United States concept of "control" over nuclear weapons, to which they reduce the problem of non-proliferation. It must be said that this very strange concept of "control", which was not previously used in the United States, has been specially invented in order to ensure, on the basis of a non-proliferation treaty, the access of the Federal Republic of Germany to nuclear weapons. The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom will hardly deny that in other cases, when they decide that certain weapons should not come under the control of other countries, they simply do not transfer those weapons to other countries.

A similar provision against transfer to other countries must also be embodied in the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. However, this provision against transfer is regrettably absent from the United States treaty, and this is one of the main reasons why we are unable to make any progress in our examination of the important question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. And now that the United States and the United Kingdom intend to satisfy the demands of the West German revanchists and militarists for nuclear weapons, a formula of control is invented such as directly provides for the possibility of transferring nuclear weapons; and here in the Committee thousands of words are wasted in order to justify such an obviously untenable position.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

Lord Chalfont stated that he is only prepared to discuss further the question on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons within the framework of this new Western concept of control (ENDC/PV.270, p.31). In other words, the Western delegations continue to wish to discuss and solve the non-proliferation problem in such a way as to leave loop-holes for the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In order to solve the non-proliferation problem, the Western Powers must abandon their unconstructive position and give the solution of the non-proliferation problem priority over plans dictated by the interests of the arms race and of strengthening the NATO military bloc, as a result of which -- I am referring to those plans -- the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee now finds itself in an impasse.

In conclusion, it is necessary to say a few words about the continuing attempts by the representatives of the Western countries to depict the position of the Soviet Union on the question of non-proliferation as being allegedly aimed at undermining NATO. We have already explained our attitude to this question more than once. It is useless to try to obtain from the Soviet Union, within the framework of a treaty on non-proliferation or in any other connexion, a blessing on the activities of the NATO bloc. This bloc was formed against the USSR and the Socialist countries. It is aggressive, it was formed for military purposes against us, and no aspects of its activities either can or will receive our approval. We regard the very existence of this bloc as dangerous to the cause of peace, and of this we make no secret.

However, as we have repeatedly stated, one ought not for that reason to try to make out that the Soviet draft treaty on non-proliferation is aimed at the destruction of NATO. Its only aim is to solve the problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In no other respect does it affect the existence of blocs. This can quite clearly be seen from the text of the Soviet draft treaty on non-proliferation.

Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) (translation from French): First of all, I should like to associate the Polish delegation with those speakers who preceded me in extending a hearty welcome to the Minister for External Affairs of India, Mr. Dinesh Singh, who is with us today. I should like to tell him how much I agree with the analyses he has made, and to assure him that the Polish delegation will spare no effort to enable the work of our Committee to make headway.

All the speakers who have expounded their views on general and complete disarmament during the last few meetings have laid stress above all on the problem of nuclear disarmament. They have all urged the need to reach an agreement on the methods of nuclear disarmament as a preliminary to general and complete disarmament. The Polish delegation fully shares this opinion. No one denies that, among the problems which still have to be solved, that of eliminating nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles is by far the most important. One might even say, without fear of being mistaken, that if we could come to an understanding the other differences which separate us would lose much of their acuteness.

If we reviewed the present state of our negotiations on general and complete disarmament, we should see that agreement in principle exists on the methods of disarmament in the field of so-called conventional weapons. The differences relate only to points of detail. We still have differences of opinion on the organization of a disarmed world and the machinery for maintaining peace in an international community deprived of weapons. On the problem of control, I think we all agree in stating that control should be exercised solely over disarmament. It is true that profound differences separate us in regard to the practical application of this principle. I believe, however, that we always envisage the solution of these problems in relation to the attitude which we adopt towards nuclear disarmament, because everything is subordinated to it, both the problem of control and the problem of organizing the machinery for the maintenance of peace in a disarmed world.

(Mr. Blusztajn, Poland)

The opposing theses are as follows. The socialist countries maintain that the process of general and complete disarmament should start with a decisive and irreversible step in nuclear disarmament, either through the destruction of stocks of nuclear weapons or through the elimination of their delivery vehicles. They believe that in the present circumstances no country concerned with its security will subscribe to a long-term plan of general and complete disarmament without being sure that, from the beginning of this process, it would not run the risk of being a victim of nuclear aggression or blackmail. For the socialist countries true disarmament can be conceived only as a definite series of measures, each of which has its own particular nature and its own specific weight corresponding to the nature of the weapons. These measures are therefore not interchangeable. There must be a priority in favour of disarmament affecting the most modern and most lethal weapons.

The Western Powers conceive general and complete disarmament as a process of gradual reduction of all armaments. They make no distinction between atomic armaments and so-called conventional armaments. One might even say that they seem convinced that the maintenance of the nuclear threat during the entire process of general and complete disarmament is an indispensable element in accomplishing this process.

Certain Western delegations saw in the Gromyko plan (ENDC/2/Rev.1/Add.1), which provides for the retention by the Soviet Union and the United States of a definite and limited number of missiles with nuclear warheads until the end of the third stage of general and complete disarmament, a recognition of the soundness of the thesis maintained by the Western Powers concerning the positive role of nuclear weapons as a guarantee of the maintenance of peace in a world that is disarming. It seems to me that an attempt is being made to create the impression that there is an agreement in principle between the position of the socialist countries and that of the Western Powers, and that the differences relate only to points of detail. It is necessary, therefore, to make the matter clear.

(Mr. Blusztajn, Poland)

It is true that we agree on the retention, by both sides, of nuclear weapons during the entire process of general and complete disarmament. But that is the only point where our views coincide; because, unfortunately, we do not agree either on the methods of establishing what is called the "nuclear umbrella" or on the purpose we wish to assign to it. According to the socialist countries the creation of this "nuclear umbrella" should result from a conscious and deliberate act, accomplished with full knowledge and based on precise data. This decision must be the result of an assessment of the quantity and quality of the nuclear weapons necessary to provide an additional guarantee that peace will not be disturbed while the world is disarming.

As for the Western Powers, their concept of nuclear protection during the process of disarmament derives automatically from their plan of general and complete disarmament. At the end of the first stage of the disarmament process, this protection will be constituted by that quantity of nuclear weapons which corresponds to two-thirds of the stocks of nuclear weapons possessed by the nuclear Powers when the agreement on general and complete disarmament is signed. At the end of the second stage, it will consist of one-third of those stocks. As for the third stage, the situation is not very clear. It depends, in fact, on the application of a whole series of political measures which have little in common with disarmament proper.

Such are the differences of approach to the methods of establishing the "nuclear umbrella". As for the purpose which it has to accomplish, the socialist countries believe that this should consist in providing an additional guarantee of the maintenance of peace during the disarmament process. The nuclear weapons to be retained by the United States and the Soviet Union until the third stage should not, therefore, constitute sufficient armament for starting a nuclear war.

(Mr. Blusztajn, Poland)

Under the Western plan for general and complete disarmament, the function of nuclear protection during the disarmament process is presented in a totally different light. Indeed, it is hardly possible to speak of nuclear protection or of an additional guarantee of the maintenance of peace, because the quantities of nuclear weapons that would remain in the hands of the nuclear Powers during the three stages of disarmament would scarcely affect their capacity to start and carry on total war.

The differences are therefore great. They can be compared to the difference between an umbrella and the sword of Damocles.

I should like on this occasion to pay tribute to the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Khallaf, for the analysis of the problem which he presented at our meeting on 7 July (ENDC/PV.271). We agree with him in saying that our supreme concern should be to be rid of such weapons completely and immediately under effective international control (*ibid.*, p.7). We have accepted the principle of a "nuclear umbrella" in the hope of responding to a very definite concern: namely, to take a step towards the position of the Western Powers and afford the possibility of concrete discussion on the accomplishment of general and complete disarmament. I agree with Mr. Khallaf when he says:

"Thus nuclear weapons retained during the disarmament process must not serve in any way to influence international relations for the benefit of any particular nuclear Power, and for all the more reason must not be used to commit aggression" (*ibid.*, p.8).

I also agree with him when he says that the "nuclear umbrella" -- Mr. Khallaf was speaking about deterrence, but I believe this is merely a question of terminology -- must be "organized in practice in such a way that it would in fact result in the neutralization of the opposing nuclear forces" (*ibid.*).

The establishment of a working group, as advocated by several delegations, for the purpose of examining the methods of nuclear disarmament within the framework of an agreement on general and complete disarmament could be useful provided that agreement were reached beforehand on the terms of reference of the working group. At present it does not seem that such an agreement is in sight. The Western Powers continue to maintain their rigid attitudes, which blocks any possibility of an

(Mr. Blusztajn, Poland)

understanding. And it is not procedural devices that will bring us closer to an understanding which depends solely upon fundamental political and military decisions.

All of us are concerned that the negotiations on general and complete disarmament should get out of the impasse. The Polish delegation would certainly not wish the report which we are to submit to the General Assembly on our work in this field to be a confession of impotence. On the other hand, we should not want to take part in a semblance of activity. It would be futile to pretend that the circumstances favour our efforts. Everyone realizes that there is a dialectical link between the positions of the Powers in our Committee and the policies which they are pursuing on the international scene. Whatever may be the verbal statements of the United States delegation in our Committee, it is difficult to believe that the United States Government is ready at present to engage in a serious discussion which would open the way to the conclusion of an agreement on general and complete disarmament. Its aggression in Viet-Nam cannot in any way be reconciled with the pursuit of the objective of an unarmed world.

Although the international situation is once again characterized by an increase in tension, we must not give up trying to find partial agreements, and we must take advantage of every tendency towards relaxation of tension. The Polish delegation is of the opinion that partial measures of this kind could be envisaged in Europe. All the peoples of Europe are concerned to see the disappearance of the last sequelae of the cold war. They wish to overcome the sterile divisions which separate them and to view their future in a new light. It is to the interest of all of them to establish peace in Europe on the foundations of collective security. Europe can become the example of a continent where rivalries will be replaced by peaceful co-operation in all fields.

The Consultative Political Committee of the Warsaw Treaty which recently met in Bucharest has painted, in its Declaration on the strengthening of peace and security in Europe, a picture of the measures which should be taken in order that the peoples of Europe, who have contributed and are contributing so much to the progress of humanity, may be able to bring about in that part of the world a climate

(Mr. Blusztajn, Poland)

of détente and mutual understanding which will make it possible to turn to account the material and spiritual wealth of each people and each State in accordance with its will.

Some of these measures --- the abolition of military alliances; the liquidation of foreign military bases; the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territories of other countries; measures aimed at eliminating the threat of nuclear conflict; the establishment of denuclearized zones; an undertaking by nuclear Powers not to use nuclear weapons against countries forming part of these zones; the prohibition of flights by foreign aircraft equipped with nuclear bombs over the territories of European countries, and the prohibition for foreign vessels having nuclear weapons aboard to put in at European ports --- have already been subjects of discussion in our Committee.

The Polish delegation would also like to stress the importance of another proposal which has been referred to many times during the work of our Committee: the proposal for the convening of a general European conference for the purpose of examining the problems relating to the guarantee of security in Europe and the establishment of general European co-operation.

The Bucharest Declaration, while expressing the interest of the countries of the Warsaw Pact in the strengthening of European security, also emphasizes their conviction that it is the duty of all European countries to contribute to the solution of world problems. In listing these problems the Declaration emphasizes, inter alia, the problem of disarmament, the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, and other measures aimed at eliminating the danger of a nuclear conflict. This position in favour of a détente and the solution of European problems is also a manifestation of the will of the member countries of the Warsaw Pact to move the cause of disarmament forward through the application of concrete measures at the political and military levels. The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has its role to play in the accomplishment of this task.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): First of all I should like to thank the Minister for External Affairs of India for having been kind enough to attend this meeting and to address us in such noble and inspired words. Each one of us, I am sure, has listened to them with the greatest attention and the deepest respect, and the Committee can derive therefrom encouragement for its future work.

I should now like to make some brief observations on the statements made this morning by the delegations of the Soviet Union and Poland.

Mr. Roshchin examined two questions: general and complete disarmament, and non-proliferation. In regard to the former, he stressed the unsatisfactory state of our negotiations. I am unfortunately obliged to share his opinion; but I should like to deduce from it the consequence that we must redouble our efforts so that our work on general and complete disarmament may make some progress. These efforts must not only relate to the question itself, but also, in a general way, aim at improving confidence among us all.

It is on this subject that I should like to make an appeal to the Soviet delegation. Mr. Roshchin has asserted that the West is no longer interested in general and complete disarmament. I should like to state in the most formal manner that, as far as we are concerned, the West is still extremely interested in this essential task of the Committee; and I would add that, precisely because of the difficulties which we encounter, we give it even more interest and wish to place in it still more hope. In a word, we face this task without pessimism, for we believe that pessimism should be banished from our discussions. In this respect I was very happy to hear Mr. Roshchin, this morning, tell the Minister for External Affairs of India that he shared his hopes. That statement formed a happy contrast with the statement we read in the Swiss press this morning, which Mr. Roshchin made yesterday during a Press conference and which unfortunately was tinged with pessimism and emphasized our difficulties.

In his intervention this morning Mr. Roshchin again spoke about the question of a working group within the framework of negotiations on general and complete disarmament. Mr. Blusztajn also spoke on this subject and stressed the importance of nuclear disarmament. I believe that this question of a working group calls for certain clarifications and should be gone into more thoroughly. I am very glad, therefore, that it has not been put aside.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

During the last meeting we had understood that the position of the Eastern European delegations on the establishment of a working group was more open. Indeed, the favourable interest which several of these delegations had accorded to the proposals put forward by Sweden during a previous session (ENDC/154; PV.247, 256) and to those made by the representative of the United Arab Republic at the present session (ENDC/PV.271) had led me to believe that they favoured the idea that the working group could concern itself with these proposals and examine them.

Today Mr. Roshchin has stated that the working group should concern itself with the "early liquidation" of nuclear delivery vehicles. But I believe that he meant rather to say "early reduction", because the very essence of the Gromyko plan is the reduction and not the total and immediate elimination of nuclear delivery vehicles. If it is indeed "early reduction", then we are not so very far from one another and it would be possible without too much difficulty to reach agreement on the terms of reference of the working group. The remarks which were made later by Mr. Blusztajn seemed to consider this possibility still far away; but I do not entirely share this point of view of the representative of Poland, and I think that it would be useful to study this question more thoroughly at a subsequent meeting.

In the second part of his intervention Mr. Roshchin spoke about non-proliferation with reference to nuclear disarmament measures which could be associated with a non-proliferation treaty in accordance with the wish expressed by several delegations of non-aligned countries. He referred to the total elimination of nuclear weapons and to other very far-reaching measures of nuclear disarmament. These are certainly measures to which in principle we should be favourable and which would certainly be useful; but they are not those which the delegations of the non-aligned countries have requested to be associated with non-proliferation, or which should follow immediately the agreement on non-proliferation. The delegations of the non-aligned countries have made a much more limited request, asking, above all, for an end to the nuclear arms race; and one of those delegations insisted, for its part, on a cut-off and on freezing measures.

Those are relatively easy measures, but so far the Soviet delegation has not accepted them. If it were desired to associate measures of nuclear disarmament with a non-proliferation agreement, I believe that it would be necessary to concentrate especially on these measures for freezing armaments and stopping the nuclear arms race.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

Lastly, Mr. Roshchin said that we are trying to obtain the Soviet Union's blessing for NATO. We are religious, but not to that extent. All we want is clarification so that we may better understand the Soviet thinking on non-proliferation and the connexions between non-proliferation and alliances. Unfortunately, the Soviet thinking on that subject is not yet completely clear to us. We hope that it will become clearer and clearer during the coming meetings. For our part, we shall continue to make every effort in order that everything may be clear among us, so that we can reach an agreement satisfactory to all.

The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): If no other member of the Committee wishes to speak, that brings this meeting to an end. I wish to thank the Minister of State for External Affairs of India for his very interesting statement, to which the Committee listened with attention and interest.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 273rd plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador A. F. Azeredo da Silveira, representative of Brazil.

"Statements were made by the representatives of India, the Soviet Union, Poland and Italy.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 19 July 1966, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 12.5 p.m.